

香港劇場年鑑2015

舞蹈・戲曲・戲劇

HONG
KONG
THEATRE
YEARBOOK
2015

Dance
Xiqu
Drama



有關二〇一五年香港舞蹈狀況的幾點思考

李海燕

「香港舞蹈年鑑」於五年前開始主動收集香港舞蹈活動資料，因此相比以往主要是靠徵集所得的，在數量和覆蓋面上均有明顯增長。二〇一五年「香港劇場年鑑」收錄舞蹈資料的基礎，是以舞蹈為主的藝文單位，其舉辦的舞蹈活動，不論是演出、工作坊、比賽、講座等，都是收錄對象。

此一收錄原則，目的是為記錄「廣義的」舞蹈狀況。廣義除了涵蓋不同舞蹈種類，亦包容舞蹈的呈現和參與方式，以及社會角色的可能性。在掌握了二〇一五年不同舞蹈種類活動的資料後，以下我將提出對收錄資料的幾點思考。

舞蹈製作數量的啟示

根據收集得來的資料，二〇一五年香港共有264個舞蹈製作¹，以546場「演出」呈現。其中，81個製作（30.6%）由康樂及文化事務署（康文署）主辦，分別為「文化節目組」15個、「藝術節辦事處」3個、「觀眾拓展辦事處」4個、「娛樂節目辦事處」59個。主辦舞台演出的通常是文化節目組，讓市民持續以不同角色參與舞蹈的，卻是主辦量達文化節目組三倍的娛樂節目辦事處。如果我們只收錄和討論在正規劇院上演的舞蹈演出，那麼我們必須同時知道，香港大部分市民很少進入劇院，亦難以透過主流傳媒認識

這些他們無法親身接觸的演出（相關論點見本文「報導和評論」部分）。在正規劇院上演的舞蹈與一般市民沒有很大關係。如果舞蹈位處市民的關注網絡之外，那麼要令舞蹈獲得更多社會資源，將會非常困難。康文署把「舞蹈」分拆四個辦公室負責，大概是意識到舞蹈多面向的社會角色；但這一分工同時也把舞蹈的文化角色，硬塞入規範性的定義之中。舞蹈對社會的意義，是否可以按行政考慮分類？如果署方能對舞蹈有更寬廣的視野，造就更多讓從業員和觀眾在所謂「專業」和「民間」舞蹈之間的流動，可能發揮更多潛力，令香港的舞蹈發展更全面。

中國舞和現代舞在全年的演出中佔的份額較大。以中國舞來說，全年64個演出製作，大部分由兩個單位主辦：「香港舞蹈團」及其外展及教育部共22個；娛樂節目辦事處35個。中國舞作為文化活動持續在民間受到歡迎，但在長篇創作上比較活躍的團體，就只數「La PenV 優之舞」和「碧華舞蹈團」。

現代舞演出製作全年共66個，其中10個由文化節目組主辦，10個由「城市當代舞蹈團」及舞蹈中心主辦，再其次便是4個小型舞團（「不加鎖舞蹈館」、「多空間」、「東邊舞蹈團」、「動藝」），和「香港演藝學院」。類似的主辦單位組合年復年出現，各團所佔比重也不過略有增減。其實每年都有（主要是）

香港演藝學院畢業生組成舞團發表舞台製作，但往往曇花一現，在一至兩個作品之後未能持續；創作力短暫爆發後便無以為繼的情況，亦見諸獨立編舞，故此多年來進佔舞台的舞蹈團體和編舞仍然是同一批。

誠然，官方對資源運用抱持的公平原則，亦令曾發表過長篇作品的獨立編舞，難以再與新人競逐機會。二〇一五年的新來者包括由香港藝術發展局資助的《不曾/忘記》舞蹈劇場，主要創作人是陳俊瑋和廖月敏；由香港賽馬會慈善信託基金資助的《數、你》，創作單位是「DepARTure」。兩個別具象徵意義的演出分別是《藝城動展——樽裝城市》，由「新約舞流」和香港中文大學藝術行政主任辦公室合辦，創作人跨舞蹈、建築和視藝三個界別，由專業與業餘舞者一同演出，是野心之作；此外，梅卓燕的《日記VI·謝幕……》以舞蹈作品成為「香港話劇團」二〇一五年「跳格黑盒EMW系列」節目之一，也許只有以梅卓燕的藝術地位，才可能成事。

二〇一五年的舞蹈演出中有13%，即34個比較冷門卻盡顯舞蹈種類多元化的演出製作，包

括西方民族舞、鋼管舞、肚皮舞、佛蘭明高等，其中18個由娛樂節目辦事處主辦。

劇院演出等同藝術的迷思

我認為有一道未經嚴格驗證的思想脈絡在香港流傳：舞蹈活動的場地和呈現形式，在活動真正發生之前已經定性了活動是否「藝術」——基於我們對場地和形式約定俗成的想像定性，而非活動內容本身。例如在正規劇院上演、長度達一小時或以上的演出，一般被認為具有藝術性。反之，在非劇院的演出，或者以非演出形式呈現的，一般被認為是民間活動，缺乏藝術性。

藝術的呈現方式與其美學有關。一些舞蹈種類，例如古典芭蕾舞，著重「控制」，要求規範和精準，也推崇單一的作者身分（authorship）。故此，這等舞蹈需要利用經過仔細鋪排的、以一位/少數作者（編舞）為重心的舞台演出呈現。認為劇院演出訴諸思考，是有識之士才懂得欣賞的「藝術」的觀念，暗示了強烈的階級思維。在二十一世紀的社會識字率和經濟結構的語境下，當代藝術家對美學、作者/參與者關係，有百花齊放

1. 包括本文內容涉及的及本文討論範圍以外的所有舞蹈種類。

的表達方式，舞蹈的藝術性是否仍然只能通過劇院演出呈現？我想這是一個非常難以回答、卻是必須思考的問題。看待藝術因人而異；「表演」的界定發展到今天，可以從場地、表演者和觀眾的關係、觀眾經驗等多種角度出發。我們有可能對「藝術性」和「呈現」施加單一的準則嗎？

二〇一五年，香港的街舞演出製作有24個，其中13個由娛樂節目辦事處主辦；此外比賽有26個、工作坊20個。根據「康體通」記錄，公開的標準舞及拉丁舞比賽至少有24個。誠然，街舞、標準舞及拉丁舞的主要呈現形式，不是舞台演出。是否因此，這些舞蹈種類不被包括在香港舞蹈藝術的論述內？如果舞蹈藝術要求動作語彙的創造，我們在劇院觀看的，有多少是舊有語彙的「重組」，有多少是原創？如果舞蹈藝術要求傑出的身體技巧，觀乎每種舞蹈都有獨特的美學要求，我們不可能比較芭蕾舞和拉丁舞的身體技巧孰高孰低，我們只可以在同一舞蹈種類之中衡量誰人達到了美學要求，誰人不能。如果舞蹈藝術要求深思熟慮的概念為創作核心，那麼我們更不應該過分概括，把「藝術」和「呈現方式」對立起來。呈現方式應該是從藝術概念生成的物質化表達，它不是概念服務的前設，不能比概念先行。

報導和評論

過去十年不斷有文化界人士提出，香港傳媒對藝術活動的報導和評論，在數量和質素方面每況愈下，舞蹈當然也不能倖免。個人認為這與香港整體藝術教育的落後有關。藝術新聞（遑論評論）對本地讀者吸引力不大，對追求盈利的媒體來說，沒啥理由要支持。就二〇一五年資料所見，265個舞蹈演出吸引了130筆報導/評論。我們應該如何理解數據？

130筆報導/評論中，傳統日報的舞蹈報導/評論佔74筆，而報導/評論的比例約為1.5比1。74筆中，關於「香港芭蕾舞團」和香港舞蹈團作品的各16筆，城市當代舞蹈團的13筆，「進念·二十面體」《舞士列傳》、東邊舞蹈團和不加鎖舞蹈館各3筆，接下來的是「香港藝術節」、「雲門舞集」、「西九文化區管理局」，加起來已是日報報導的八成。傳統日報的編輯對大團的重視，是因為江湖地位？較為讀者認識？大團的新聞稿比較詳盡？大團的廣告投放比較多？原因無法一概而論，但要知道，吸引繁忙記者注意力的除了出色的新聞稿之外，也需要經悉心培育的傳媒關係；香港的日報雖然堅守編輯自主原則，但不拒斥與廣告掛勾的演前報導。從數據來看，小型舞團和獨立編舞，實在難以透過主流媒體接觸市民。

幸好有少數印刷或網上媒體（雖然只是有限程度地）平衡了日報在報導對象方面的篩選。全年在《舞蹈手札》、《三角志》、《art plus》、《立場新聞》、《藝頻》及「國際演藝評論家協會（香港分會）」網上平台的舞評共有56筆，評論的作品包羅萬有。香港電台第二台的《演藝風流》節目的舞蹈評論則有12次。該節目長度在二〇一五年由一小時縮短成半小時，在一定程度上影響了討論的深度。

香港現有的舞評很多時是報導式的演後總結，內容也傾向陳述個人喜惡，對社會關連、舞蹈生態或系統化的美學分析不多。我認為與整體藝術教育落後同樣有關。報導和評論可以催生新的觀念，但也可以強化既有的教條（canon）和價值判斷，所以評論人的藝術學養的重要性，並不亞於評論版面大小和流通量。舞蹈創作者有時把舞評人視為自己的批評者，把他們放在自己的對立面，事實卻是兩者可以通過合作，推動舞蹈生態更健康和更平衡的發展。

結語

二〇一五年「香港劇場年鑑」致力通過數據，描繪香港廣義的舞蹈狀況。「廣義的」舞蹈不單指形式上的廣義，同時著重舞蹈的社會角色。我們推崇高水平的舞蹈實踐為藝

術，承認藝術是精神面貌的呈現，但藝術不能、也不應負擔舞蹈所有的社會意義。在資本社會如香港，舞蹈是獨立思維的自我實踐、反映價值觀的文化活動，還是配合社會秩序的文明產物？當我們說「香港的舞蹈」時，我們其實在說甚麼？我們是否應該回溯香港現行的（形式上和功能上的）舞蹈分類法，有多少受資助系統和學院課程設計影響？所謂專業、業餘，所謂藝術舞蹈、體育舞蹈，對我們了解舞蹈與生活的關係，有甚麼幫助？香港人普遍對藝術認識不深、興趣不大，藝術在社會地位不彰，而且不斷被誤解，被錯誤的政策淡化為商品化的創意工業。深受不安全感影響的藝術從業員，會否因而變得偏執，死守位處邊陲、只有丁方大小的領土，唯恐一天城門打開，便連寸土也留不住。與此同時，世界各地的藝術家，力求改變規條化範疇概念的思維，使藝術能盡忠職守地回應當今的社會意識，反映生存境況，不會因為追隨不合時宜的美學而被唾棄。當我們說「香港的舞蹈」時，我們希望社會說甚麼？

李海燕

從事文字及藝術行政工作，亦為不同刊物撰寫文化藝術評論，文章散見於港、澳、台刊物及網媒。

Reflections on Hong Kong Dance in 2015

Joanna Lee

Five years ago, the Hong Kong Dance Yearbook initiated a year-round data collection on top of its pre-publication call for submissions. Since then there has been an impressive expansion in the quantity and scope of information that covers Hong Kong dance. In 2015, this endeavour was continued. The basic unit of data collection is organised around dance-related activities which may include performances, workshops, contests and discussions.

Adopting an inclusive approach to various formats enables the Hong Kong Theatre Yearbook to present Hong Kong dance from a broad perspective: broad in terms of the forms of dance, the modes of dance presentation and participation, and the obvious or latent roles of dance in society. The data thus compiled calls for reflection and deliberation on certain areas, elucidated in the following reflections.

Insights from the number of dance productions

In 2015, 264 dance productions¹, presented in 546 performances, were documented. Of these productions, 81 (30.6%) were presented by the Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD), including 15 by the Cultural Presentation Section, three by the Festival Office, four by the Audience

Building Office, and 59 by the Entertainment Office of LCSD. While it is the Cultural Presentation Section which presents the majority of theatre productions, it is the Entertainment Office which enables the public to attend the most dance performances in various formats as it presents three times as many programmes as the Cultural Presentation Section. If the Theatre Yearbook restricts data collection to theatre productions, one should be well aware of the fact that these productions rarely reach a majority of the population. The lion's share of the local population are non-theatre-goers. They often do not read about theatre productions in mainstream media (I will discuss this further in the "Press coverage and reviews" section of this article.) As dance is off the radar for most citizens, it is difficult to garner more attention or resources for dance in our society. On the one hand, the presentation of "dance" by four different sections/offices of LCSD exemplifies the multifaceted roles of dance in society; on the other hand, it suggests an administrative delineation of dance/life relationships. It is possible to contain such relationships within operational considerations? If LCSD could embrace a broader vision by opening up its self-imposed criteria of so-called "professional" and "community" dance productions, it would facilitate the exchange of experience and dialogue necessary for a diverse and inclusive development of Hong Kong dance.

Chinese dance and modern dance take up larger shares among the production year-total. A total of 64 Chinese dance productions were presented throughout the year; the majority of them presented by two organisers: 22 by the Hong Kong Dance Company and its Outreach and Education Department; 35 by the Entertainment Office of LCSD. While Chinese dance continues to be widely practised, La P en V and Alan & Becky Dance Group are the only dance troupes actively creating new, evening-length works.

There were 66 modern dance productions in 2015. Major presenters were: the Cultural Presentation Section of LCSD (presenting ten productions), City Contemporary Dance Company (CCDC) and CCDC Dance Centre (presenting ten productions), four small dance companies (Unlock Dancing Plaza, Y-Space, E-Side Dance Company, DanceArt), and The Hong Kong Academy for Performing Arts (HKAPA). This presenter line-up and their respective count of annual productions have been more or less repeated on an annual basis. A factor contributing to this recurring pattern is the difficulty of sustaining

one's creative drive. Year after year there have been mostly HKAPA graduates presenting their debut as group works, but many stopped after one or two productions. This situation can be seen among independent choreographers as well. As a result, the stages of Hong Kong's theatres have been peopled by the same dance companies and choreographers over many years.

Aggravating the situation is the "fair principle" upheld by public funders. When it comes to grant approval, independent choreographers who have presented full-length works may be in a less advantageous position than newcomers for the sheer consideration that public money should be "fairly" distributed. Newcomers in 2015 included *Not Yet/To Forget* by Chan Chun-wai and Sudhee Liao Yue-min, supported by the Hong Kong Arts Development Council, and *Count, You (shu ni)* by DepARTure. What is noteworthy is that both productions position themselves as dance theatres. Also noteworthy are two other productions, equally symbolic but in different ways. *Urban Bottling – In the Search of Space In a Cramped City* co-presented by Passover Dance and The Office of Arts Administrator at The Chinese University of Hong

1. Include productions of all dance forms discussed in this article and beyond.

Kong, is an ambitious production featuring artists who work in dance, architecture and visual arts. Also on the list is *Diary VI, Applause...* by Mui Cheuk-yin, a 2015 "Hong Kong Repertory Theatre Black Box EMV" programme. The programme might only have come to fruition because of Mui's status as an artist.

Of the 2015 productions, 34 (13%) were less mainstream programmes that exemplified the diversity of dance. They were performances of Western folk dance, pole dance, belly dance and flamenco dance, among others. Of the productions in this group, 18 were presentations by the Entertainment Office.

Anything goes under the roof of the theatre?

It seems to me that a general belief, somewhat unchallenged, prevails in Hong Kong: that the format and the venue of dance presentation determine its artistry before it actually happens. We call a performance, a priori, "artistic", based on conventional attributes of its venue and format. Anything taking place in formal theatres with a duration of an hour or more are usually regarded as "artistic", while performances in alternative venues or dance presented in formats other than performance are regarded as vernacular and lacking in artistry.

One should bear in mind that the aesthetics of the arts and how it is presented go hand in hand. Certain dance forms, for example classical ballet, value "control", qualified standards and precision; also valued is authorial omniscience. Such aesthetic criteria require meticulously planned stage performances, designed by one or a few authors (choreographers). Equating the theatre to artistry can possibly be ascribed to the thinking that only the intelligent and the educated could appreciate the theatre, a thinking loaded with hierarchical prejudice. In the context of the overall literacy rate and economic structure of the 21st century, there is a plethora of ways for contemporary art to communicate its aesthetics. Author and authorship should be reflected upon and thereafter repositioned. Is it still true that dance is artistic only when it comes in the form of theatre performance? This is a difficult question, but beyond doubt one that necessitates deliberation. Not everyone supports the notion of "anything goes" when it comes to what makes an artwork "art". By the same token it is hasty to regard anything under the roof of the theatre as art. The artistry of contemporary performance is a function of the sedulous choice of the venue, performer-spectator relationship, participant experience, and many other factors. Is it thus even possible to imagine one single approach to "artistry" and "presentation"?

In 2015, there were 26 street dance contests, 20 workshops, and 24 productions, 13 of which were presented by the Entertainment Office. According to the records available on URB TIX, there were at least 24 open ballroom and Latin dance contests. Arguably, Hip-hop, ballroom and Latin dance do not always present themselves as theatre performance. Is that why they have mostly been left out of the discourse on dance in Hong Kong? If the art of dance requires original language, how often do we see a new dance language in a theatre performance, or how often do we see a re-organisation of the existing language? If the art of dance requires physical skills, the best claim we could possibly make when comparing a ballet dancer with a Latin dancer in terms of physical skills is whether they meet the respective aesthetic requirements, but we cannot compare one dancer against the other. If the art of dance requires well thought-out concepts, there is no reason for us to put form before concept. In some art forms, the form serves the concept; in others, the form is the concept. When the concept serves the form, the debate usually considers whether it is art or not.

Press coverage and reviews

Throughout the last decade, many in the cultural sector have repeatedly expressed their concern about the diminishing quantity and quality of art news

coverage and reviews in the local press. Dance is no exception. I see this as a problem rooted in the backwardness of Hong Kong's art education. As there is no demand for art news from the readers, there is no reason for the profit-driven local press to be interested in covering and reviewing the arts. In 2015, there were 130 pieces of coverage or reviews about 265 dance productions. How should this figure be interpreted?

Among the 130 pieces of coverage or review, 74 were published in print dailies. The proportion of coverage to review is around 1.5:1. Out of the 74 total, 16 each went to the Hong Kong Ballet and the Hong Kong Dance Company; 13 went to CCDC, E-Side, Unlock Dancing Plaza, and *The World According to Dance* by Zuni Icosahedron, each attracting three pieces. Then there were coverage or reviews of the programmes of the Hong Kong Arts Festival, Cloud Gate Dance Theatre, and the West Kowloon Cultural District, taking up about 80% of all coverage of dance in 2015.

Has there been a disposition towards large organisations? If so, is it in regards to their relative scale? Is it because they are better-known to readers? Is it the result of more effective press releases, or a larger advertising budget? There is no single answer, but I do know that media relationships are better

nurtured when more manpower and resources are available. Notwithstanding editorial integrity, advertorials are acceptable to editors. Judging from the data, one may conclude that it is difficult for small companies and individual choreographers to make themselves known to the public through the local press.

Fortunately, there is a handful of publications and online media platforms that complement the diversity of coverage to some extent. In 2015, 56 interviews and reviews were published in *dance journal/hk*, *Delta Zhi*, *art plus*, *Stand News*, *arts-news*, and on the website of International Association of Theatre Critics (Hong Kong). Productions of all scales and dance forms were reported and reviewed in these venues. In the meantime, ten productions were featured on RTHK's weekly radio programme *Yanyi Fengliu*, but in 2015 the duration of the programme was reduced by half to 30 minutes, which greatly affected the depth of discussion.

Reviews of Hong Kong dance are generally geared towards descriptive summaries of the performance and personal (dis)inclination. Rarely do we see thematic analyses referencing social context, dance ecology or aesthetic philosophy. I again ascribe this circumstance to the backwardness of our art education. Coverage and reviews may push

boundaries or reinforce canonised value judgements. While we are concerned about the quantity of press coverage, we should also bear in mind that truly cultivated critics are not patronisers. Education and integrity make the critics the artists' partners in building a balanced and refined dance culture.

Conclusion

In 2015, the Hong Kong Theatre Yearbook strives to convey, through facts and data, a broader picture of Hong Kong's dance scene. "Broader" goes beyond dance's various forms. It also acknowledges the various roles dance plays in society. While we regard quality dance practice as art and accept artworks as the materialisation of the mind, we do not suggest art to be the only means for dance to be connected with society. What is dance to Hong Kong, a capitalist city? Is dance the self-realisation of independent thinking? Is dance a cultural activity that speaks of and to the value of its citizens? Is dance a means to reinforce the societal delineation, a synonym for civilisation? What do we really mean when we say "Hong Kong dance"? Shouldn't we look into how the current formal and functional categorisation of dance has been influenced by our grant system and institutional curriculum? How do the tumultuous labels such as "professional dance", "amateurish dance", "sports dance" and the like help us understand the relationship between dance and

life? The arts have never been a clarion call for the typical Hongkonger. Marginalised as they have been, the arts are generally misunderstood; they have been made to collide with the commercialised creative industries as a result of misguided government policies. Insecure art practitioners hold tight to their tiny bit of territory, apprehensive of losing their meager turf if they revisit and reconsider how those borders were once marked. On the international scale, contemporary artists are making every effort to change the canonised mindset, so that the arts might be able to responsibly respond to society before it is forsaken due to its outdated aesthetics. When we say "Hong Kong dance", what is it we want to hear from the society?

.....

Joanna Lee

Joanna Lee is an editor, writer and arts administrator. Her arts and cultural critiques can be found in publications in Hong Kong, Macau and Taiwan.

.....

香港劇場年鑑2015（舞蹈、戲曲、戲劇）

版次 2017年3月初版

資助：香港藝術發展局

編輯及統籌：陳國慧

執行編輯及資料統籌：羅靖雯

專題論述編輯：朱琮愛、黃進之、楊寶霖*

專題論述及資料統籌（舞蹈）：林奕玲

專題論述及資料統籌（戲曲）：盧敏樺

專題論述及資料統籌（應用戲劇）：歐怡雯

資料搜集統籌（神功戲）：張文珊

資料整理及校對（戲曲）：朱卓怡、余凱域

資料整理及校對（神功戲）：張文珊、翟麗芳、孫名慧

資料協作伙伴：

香港舞蹈界聯席會議－香港舞蹈年鑑編輯室、

香港戲劇協會、香港教育劇場論壇、

香港八和會館、八和粵劇學院、

香港中文大學音樂系（戲曲資料中心）、art-mate.net

協作伙伴：香港戲劇工程

封面、內文設計：TGIF

網頁設計及程式編寫：AlphaSoft Design Ltd.

© 國際演藝評論家協會（香港分會）有限公司

版權所有，本書任何部分未經版權持有人許可，

不得翻印、轉載或翻譯。

出版：

國際演藝評論家協會（香港分會）有限公司

香港灣仔港灣道2號香港藝術中心12樓1201-2室

電話：(852) 2974 0542 傳真：(852) 2974 0592

網址：http://www.iatc.com.hk 電郵：iatc@iatc.com.hk

國際書號 ISBN: 978-988-13598-7-2



International Association
of Theatre Critics (Hong Kong)
國際演藝評論家協會（香港分會）



香港藝術發展局
Hong Kong Arts Development Council

國際演藝評論家協會（香港分會）為藝發局資助團體
IATC(HK) is financially supported by the HKADC

Hong Kong Theatre Yearbook 2015 (Dance, Xiqu, Drama)

First published in March 2017

Supported by: Hong Kong Arts Development Council

Editor and Coordinator: Bernice Chan Kwok-wai

Executive Editor and Research Coordinator: Queenie Law Ching-man

Feature Article Editors: Daisy Chu King-oi, Nicolette Wong Chun-chi, Yeung Po-lam*

Feature Article and Research Coordinator (Dance): Elaine Lam Yick-ling

Feature Article and Research Coordinator (Xiqu): Jacqueline Lo Mun-wa

Feature Article and Research Coordinator (Applied Drama): Au Yi-man

Research Coordinator (Ritual Performance): Milky Cheung Man-shan

Researchers (Drama): Chu Cheuk-yee, Yu Hoi-wik

Researchers (Ritual Performance):

Milky Cheung Man-shan, Iris Chak Lai-fong, Portia Suen Ming-wai

Research Partners:

Hong Kong Dance Sector Joint Conference - The Hong Kong Dance Yearbook

Editorial Board, Hong Kong Federation of Drama Societies,

Hong Kong Drama/Theatre and Education Forum,

The Chinese Artists Association of Hong Kong,

The Cantonese Opera Academy of Hong Kong, Music Department,

The Chinese University of Hong Kong (Chinese Opera Information Centre),

art-mate.net

Partner: Hong Kong Theatre Works

Cover and Content Design: TGIF

Website Design and Software Development: AlphaSoft Design Ltd.

© International Association of Theatre Critics (Hong Kong) Limited

All rights reserved; no part of this book may be reproduced, transmitted or translated without the prior written permission of the copyright holder.

Published by:

International Association of Theatre Critics (Hong Kong) Limited

Rm 1201-2, 12/F, Hong Kong Arts Centre, 2 Harbour Road, Wan Chai, Hong Kong

Tel: (852) 2974 0542

Fax: (852) 2974 0592

Website: http://www.iatc.com.hk

Email: iatc@iatc.com.hk

香港藝術發展局全力支持藝術表達自由，本計劃內容並不反映本局意見。

Hong Kong Arts Development Council fully supports freedom of artistic expression. The views and opinions expressed in this project do not represent the stand of the Council.

*藝術行政人員實習計劃由香港藝術發展局資助。*The Arts Administration Internship Scheme is supported by the Hong Kong Arts Development Council.